



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,139	09/27/2001	Jayasenana Sundara Ganesh	47377/JEC/X2/132312	4932
35114	7590	05/31/2005	EXAMINER	
ALCATEL INTERNETWORKING, INC. ALCATEL-INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2 PLANO, TX 75075			HOANG, THAI D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2667	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/967,139

Applicant(s)

GANESH ET AL.

Examiner

Thai D. Hoang

Art Unit

2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-26, 28-33, 35-40 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 13, 20, 27, 34 and 41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2, 16, 23, 30 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not disclose to support the limitation "the offset value is configurable by a user" (emphasis added) as recited in the claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2667

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-26, 28-33, 35-40 and 42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,087 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims 1-42 of the present application merely broaden claims 1-23 of the patent.

Regarding claims 1-2, 8-9, 15-16, 22-23, 29-30 and 36-37 (wherein claims 2, 16, 23, 30 and 37 as best understood), claims 1, 10, 16 and 20 of the patent specifies all the limitation of claims 1-2, 8-9, 15-16, 22-23, 29-30 and 36-37 of the application. Claims 1-2, 8-9, 15-16, 22-23, 29-30 and 36-37 of the application merely broaden claims 1, 10, 16 and 20 of the patent by omitting some elements and/or and functions.

Referring to claims 3, 10, 17, 24, 31 and 38, claims 9, 14 and 21 of the patent specifies all the limitation of claims 3, 10, 17, 24, 31 and 38 of the application.

Regarding claims 4, 11, 18, 25, 32 and 39, claim 22 of the patent specifies all the limitation of claims 3, 10, 17, 24, 31 and 38 of the application.

Regarding claims 5, 12, 19, 26, 33 and 40, claim 23 of the patent specifies all the limitation of claims 5, 12, 19, 26, 33 and 40 of the application.

Regarding claims 7, 14, 21, 28, 35 and 42, claim 15 of the patent specifies all the limitation of claims 7, 14, 21, 28, 35 and 42 of the application.

It has been held that the omission an element and its functions is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same as before. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also, note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 13, 20, 27, 34 and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the application:

US Patent No. 5,959,976 A, Kuo, "Method and device for filtering transmission."

US Patent No. 5,951,651 A, Lakshman et al, "Packet filter system using BITMAP vector of filter rules for routing packet through network."

US Patent No. 5,608,662 A, Large et al, "Packet filter engine."

US Patent No. 5,473,607 A, Hausman et al, "Packet filtering for data networks."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai D. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00am-18:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang



CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

5/27/05